

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are present in this application. claim 21 being added by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-9 and 12-20 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over US 6,559,419 (Sol et al.). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Sol et al. in view of U.S. 5,390,595 (Cutcher).

Claim 21 is supported by Figure 2, and no new matter is believed to be added.

The claims of the present application are directed to a substrate having an electrically conducting and heatable coating. A communication window is made in the coating in the form of the interruption. An electrical conducting covering is provided in the window, the covering having a plurality of interruptions. The interruptions advantageously provide for communication through the window. The covering may also be heated or act as a sun visor.

Turning to the prior art rejections, the Office Action refers to Figure 2 of Sol et al., describing conductive bus bar portions 7b, 7c and 7d as corresponding to the electrically conducting element of claim 1, bar portions 7b, 7c and 7d as corresponding to the electrically conducting covering of claim 1, and area 4d where coating 3 is deleted as corresponding to the communication window of claim 1. As described in column 5, lines 22-31, conductive bus bar portions 7a, 7e and 7f can be located along the edge of the window even though they may be spaced inwardly from the edges of the window to an extent. Looking at Figure 2, conductive bars 7a, 7b, 7c and 7d surround the deletion area 4d but do not come into contact with at least one part of the edges of the window. The deletion area 4d also does not have a plurality of interruptions. The deletion area 4d is a single interruption in the coating 3.

Even if the conductive bars may be in contact with edges of the deletion area 4d, there is still no disclosure in Sol et al. of a covering in the window having a plurality of interruptions in the window. Sol et al., in column 5, describes placing the bar portions near

the edge of the window without mentioning their location relative to area 4d. Figure 2 shows the bar portions located away from the edges of area 4d. Moreover, the window of claim 1 includes a conductive covering electrically connected to the conducting element. Window 4d in Sol et al. does not have a conductive covering electrically connected to bus bar portions 7a, 7b, 7c and 7d. The bus bar portions surround the window 4d and are not connected to an edge of the window, the coating and a conductive covering of the window.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not disclosed by Sol et al.

Claim 2 recites that the covering covers all sides of the edges of the window and comprises an electrically conducting element. The Office Action refers to elements 7b, 7c, 7d and 7g disposed on the coating, asserting it covers all the side edges of the window. In Figure 2, the conductive bars are not disposed on the edges of the deletion area 4d. Moreover, the Office Action refers to the conductive bars as corresponding to the conducting element. It is not clear from the Office Action which portion of the conductive bars corresponds to the coating and which corresponds to the electrically conducting element in contact with at least one part of the edges of the window. In any case, there is no disclosure in Sol et al. of a window having an electrically conductive covering with a plurality of interruptions in the window, and the covering covers all sides of the edges of the communication window.

Claim 7 recites the interruptions in the covering comprised slot antennas tuned to the communication radiation through the communication window. The Office Action simply refers to the conductive bars 7b, 7d and 7c of Figure 2. These portions surround the deletion area 4d, but do not consist of an interruption in the cover in the window, and further there is clearly no mention of any interruption comprising a slot antenna, or an interruption which is tuned to communication radiation through the communication window. Sol et al. simply

provides a deletion area 4d with no mention whatsoever of tuning the window to communication radiation through the window. Claim 7 is clearly not disclosed by Sol et al.

In claim 9, the interruptions comprise crossed slots and slots oriented perpendicular to one another. There is only one opening from the deletion area 4d, and clearly this cannot consist of crossed slots or slots oriented alternately perpendicularly to each other. The slots of claim 9 require a plurality of slots, and there is only one opening made with the deletion area 4d. Claim 9 is also not disclosed by Sol et al.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 including Cutcher. Cutcher is cited for the use of conducting ink. Even if the elements in Sol et al. are made with conducting ink, the combination would still be deficient for the reasons described above. Accordingly, Cutcher does not remedy the deficiencies in Sol et al., and the pending claims are also patentable over a combination of Sol et al. and Cutcher.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Carl E. Schlier
Registration No. 34,426